

**REMARKS**

The Examiner argues that Suzuki discloses all of the limitations of claims 1 and 2, with the exception of the cable being a coaxial cable, and that the inclusion of this missing limitation would have been obvious in view of Kropa et al. Applicant agrees with the Examiner that Suzuki does not disclose or suggest use of a coaxial cable, but submits that additional limitations of currently amended claim 2 are neither disclosed nor suggested by Suzuki. Applicant further submits that these same limitations, together with the admittedly missing limitation of use of a coaxial cable, are neither suggested nor disclosed by Kropa et al. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the references relied upon by the Examiner, alone or in combination, cannot anticipate or render obvious currently amended claim 2.

Suzuki, rather than disclosing “[a] structure for connecting an electrical connector to a coaxial cable, said coaxial cable including cable cores each having a core conductor and a core sheath,” discloses a low-permittivity connector 11 for connecting to a flat cable 9 having a *plurality* of rigid plated wires 104 that are sandwiched between *a pair* of PTFE tapes 114. Col. 4, lines 56-64, FIG. 4. Each of Suzuki’s plated wires 104 are rigid copper cords gilded or plated with silver or another metal and therefore not *cable cores* comprised of a *core conductor* and a *cable sheath*. As such, Suzuki does not disclose or suggest a structure for connecting *to a coaxial cable including cable cores, each cable core having a core conductor and a core sheath*.

Further, rather than disclosing “[a] structure for connecting an electrical connector to a coaxial cable . . . wherein the core conductors of the cable cores are exposed by peeling a leading end of said cable and connected to respective contacts of the electrical connector,” Suzuki discloses sandwiching rigid plated wires 104 between flat PTFE tapes 114 and sintering the assembly to form a flat cable 9 having rigid wires 104 that extend beyond one edge of the fused

PTFE tapes 114. Col. 4, lines 56-64, FIG. 4. Indeed, Suzuki does not explain whether wires 104, as assembled and before sintering, already extend beyond the edge of tapes 114, or whether flat cable 9 is manufactured as a continuous sheet and then tapes 114 are peeled away to expose wires 104. Whichever method is used, Suzuki does not disclose, or even suggest, *core conductors of the cable cores* being exposed by *peeling away a leading end* of the *coaxial cable*. In Suzuki, there are no core conductors of cable cores to be exposed and no leading end of a coaxial cable to be peeled away.

Further, rather than disclosing “[a] structure for connecting an electrical connector to a coaxial cable . . . said structure comprising a dielectric member having air contained therein arranged to cover at least part of the exposed portions of said cable cores of the cable,” Suzuki discloses a low-permittivity connector 11 comprising ribbon like metal contacts 31 attached to a low permittivity sheet 21 that is sandwiched between a pair of corrugated PTFE sheets 51 leaving openings adjacent to the contacts 31 for the insertion of wires 104 of flat cable 9. Col. 3, line 49 to col. 4, line 2, FIGS. 1-3. Even if the plated wires 104 were deemed equivalent to the claimed cable cores and core sheaths, which they are not, as discussed above, Suzuki’s connector 11, comprising ribbon like metal contacts 31 attached to a low permittivity sheet 21 and embedded between two corrugated PTFE sheets 51, is not “a dielectric member having air contained therein.”

For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that Suzuki, in addition to failing to disclose the limitation of a coaxial cable, fails to disclose further limitation of claim 2. Applicant respectfully submits that these same limitations, including the missing limitation of a coaxial cable, are neither disclosed nor suggested by Kropa et al.

Rather than disclosing “[a] structure for connecting an electrical connector to a coaxial cable, said coaxial cable including cable cores each having a core conductor and a core sheath,” Kropa et al. discloses a connector for connecting to the electrical conductors **102** of *individual and discrete* cables or wires **100**, explaining that, for example, such individual cables or wires **100** may be the data transfer cables used for connecting a computer to peripheral devices. Col. 3, lines 1-18, FIGS. 1, 2 and 4. As such, Kropa et al.’s cables or wires **100**, rather than being the cable core elements of a single coaxial cable attached to an electrical connector, are each discrete cables that are individually and separately attached to an electrical connector. Therefore, Kropa et al. neither discloses nor suggests “[a] structure for connecting an electrical connector to a *coaxial cable, said coaxial cable including cable cores each having a core conductor and a core sheath.*”

Further, rather than disclosing “[a] structure for connecting an electrical connector to a coaxial cable . . . wherein the core conductors of the cable cores are exposed by peeling a leading end of said cable and connected to respective contacts of the electrical connector,” Kropa et al. merely discloses that the electrical conductor **102** of each cable **100** that is threaded through a ferrule **18** is connected to corresponding contacts **16** using known, but unspecified, techniques. Col. 3, lines 14-18. As such, Kropa et al. cannot disclose or suggest exposing the core conductors of the cable cores, since cables or wires **100** are not cable cores, and cannot suggest or disclose “peeling a leading end of said cable,” since there is no leading end of said coaxial cable to be peeled.

Further, rather than disclosing “[a] structure for connecting an electrical connector to a coaxial cable . . . said structure comprising a dielectric member having air contained therein arranged to cover at least part of the exposed portions of said cable cores of the cable,” Kropa et

al. discloses that a “ferrule member **18** acts a strain relief and holds the electrical cable **100** in the back shell **12** of the connector **10**.” Col. 3, lines 19-21, FIG. 2. Kropa et al.’s ferrules **18** (which may be made of a solid piece of a conductor or an insulator, col. 5, lines 5-9) are sized to hold fast intact electrical cables **100** and not merely the electrical conductors **102** contained therein. Col. 3, lines 19-21, FIG. 2. As such, rather than covering the *exposed* electrical connectors **102**, Kropa et al.’s ferrules **18** *tightly* cover the intact cables **100** themselves. FIG. 2. Therefore, Kropa et al. neither discloses nor suggests “ a dielectric member *having air contained therein* arranged *to cover* at least part of *the exposed portions of said cable cores*.”

For at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that, even if there were a motivation to combine Suzuki and Kropa et al. in the manner suggested by the Examiner, these references., alone or in combination, cannot disclose or suggest every limitation of currently amended claim 2.

Applicant further respectfully submits that, since claims 5-9, 11 and 12 all depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 2, and so contain all of its limitation, these dependent claims cannot be anticipated or rendered obvious by the prior art relied upon by the Examiner.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully solicit the allowance of the pending claims. In the event that the application is not deemed in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned. Applicants are aware of no fees due with this submission. If any fees are required, the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account Number 02-4377.

August 23, 2005

Respectfully submitted,



---

Paul A. Ragusa  
PTO Reg. No. 38,587  
(212) 408-2588

David Loretto  
PTO Reg. No. 44,374  
(212) 408-2584

*Attorneys for Applicant*  
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, NY 10112